

REMARKS

The indication that claims 1-14 are allowable over the prior art is appreciated.

With respect to the objections to the specification, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully solicited in view of the following remarks.

On the issue of the Appendices, it is believed that the undersigned's mis-labeling of those three sections of the specification may have contributed to the problem. It will be noted that those three sections are not at the end of the application as is more typical of appendices, but constitute Pages 29-38 of a specification totaling 44 pages with the claims and Abstract following the Appendices, and thus the sections labeled Appendices are embedded in the body of the specification. It is believed appropriate to label different sections of the specification for ease of reading, and that is what has been done in the present amendment.

In particular:

1. Appendix A has been relabeled Section IX-Theorem Proofs and as such referred to elsewhere in the specification;
2. Appendix B has been deleted and the references, to published papers in reputable journals, added to the specification;
3. Appendix C has been deleted and replaced by Section X, and the table labels of Table I, Table II, and Table III retained.
4. In the description itself, all references to Appendix have been omitted and replaced by the new section headings.

It is believed that these changes are in conformity with the Rules and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection in Paragraph 2 of the Office action are respectfully requested.

With regard to the Objection stated in Paragraph 3, attached herewith are the remaining references that had been omitted from the Information Disclosure Statement because of the undersigned's belief that they were less material than those originally included. Any fees that may be required should be charged to the appropriate Deposit Account

5. With regard to the Objection stated in Paragraph 4, it is respectfully pointed out that the applicant has fulfilled his responsibility to disclose the best mode known to him at the time the application was filed. But the applicant also believed that, since the disclosure was addressed to those of his peers, those of ordinary skill in the art including the necessary mathematical skills, it

behooved him to disclose not only his preferred solution, but also to direct them to published papers in reputable journals that offered alternative solutions that they were perhaps more familiar with. Note that Page 11 clearly states that the methods disclosed in references 4 and 5 are the most popular as simpler, but that his double precision version described in detail in Pages 11-16 is preferred. Thus, a full and complete disclosure of the applicant's best mode is present. It would seem to be in the public interest for full disclosure for the applicant to also disclose some alternative methods that he is aware of that may be of more assistance to those persons of ordinary skill in the art , but to avoid a detailed description that is already present in published scientific papers and thus would unnecessarily add more complexity and length to an already long and complex specification.

For these reasons, the references 4 and 5 have been retained, and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection stated in Paragraph 4 of the office action.

It is believed that the present amendment places the case in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: March 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Walt Thomas Zielinski
Registration No.: 18,902

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant

Attachments: Information Disclosure Statement with attached references.